

### REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 13 and 15-38 are pending with claims 1-4 and 19-21 being independent. Claims 1-4 have been amended, claims 5, 9-12 and 14 have been canceled, and claims 19-38 have been added. Support for the amendments and the new claims may be found in the application at, for example, page 5, line 24 to page 8, line 2; page 10, line 25 to page 13, line 7; and FIGS. 1, 2 and 4. No new matter has been introduced.

### ***Claim Objections – 35 U.S.C. § 112***

Claims 1-4 were objected to because of grammatical errors and for being indefinite. Claims 1-4 have been amended to address these objections. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections in view of these amendments.

### ***Double Patenting***

Claim 3, 4, 7, 10, 11, 13-15, 17 and 18 were rejected for obviousness-type double patenting over claim 2 of U.S. Patent Number 6,742,762 (“Koyama”) in view of U.S. Publication Number 2003/0063243 (“Roosendaal”). Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because neither claim 2 of Koyama, Roosendaal, nor any proper combination of the two describes or suggests that “the first light emitting element comprises a first electroluminescent layer between a first electrode and a second electrode... the second light emitting element comprises a second electroluminescent layer between the first electrode and a third electrode... [and] the first electrode covers the first electroluminescent layer and the second electroluminescent layer,” as recited in each of amending claims 3 and 4.

### ***Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102***

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 9, 12 and 16 were rejected as being anticipated by Roosendaal. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection in view of the amendments to independent claims 1 and 2.

As amended, claim 1 recites a display device including a pixel portion in which a plurality of pixels are arranged in a matrix over a substrate. At least one of the pixels comprises a first light emitting element and a second light emitting element. The first light emitting

element comprises a first electroluminescent layer between a first electrode and a second electrode, and the second light emitting element comprises a second electroluminescent layer between the first electrode and a third electrode. The first electrode covers the first electroluminescent layer and the second electroluminescent layer. The first light emitting element emits light in a first direction, and the second light emitting element emits light in a second direction which is opposite to the first direction.

To illustrate and provide context for subject matter of claim 1, a non-limiting example with respect to FIG. 1 of the present application discloses a first light emitting element 6013 and a second light emitting element 6023. The first light emitting element 6013 includes a first electrode corresponding to a cathode 6012 and a second electrode corresponding to an anode 6010. The second light emitting element 6023 includes the first electrode corresponding to the cathode 6012 and a third electrode corresponding to an anode 6030. As such, the first electrode corresponding to the cathode 6012 is common in the both the first and second light emitting elements 6013 and 6023 and covers an electroluminescent layer 6011.

Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 because Roosendaal fails to describe or suggest at least that “the first light emitting element comprises a first electroluminescent layer between a first electrode and a second electrode[,] ... the second light emitting element comprises a second electroluminescent layer between the first electrode and a third electrode ... [and] the first electrode covers the first electroluminescent layer and the second electroluminescent layer,” as recited in claim 1.

Roosendaal relates to “an apparatus comprising a display device having a flat display, provided with means for visualizing images in two planes located on opposite sides of the display.” Paragraph [001]. Roosendaal provides a few example of such an apparatus. For example, Roosendaal, in FIGS. 1A-1B and 2A-2B, illustrates a laptop computer and a mobile telephone, respectively, each including a display device that seems to enable viewing from both sides of the display. Although Roosendaal may show a display device suitable for viewing from two sides, Roosendaal does not show the arrangement recited in claim 1.

The Office Action relies on FIG. 3 and paragraphs [0024] to [0027] of Roosendaal to

show the features of claim 1. However, neither this section of Roosendaal nor any other section describes or suggests doing so. FIG. 3 of Roosendaal illustrates a light-modulating device 10. The light modulating device 10 includes a liquid crystal material 12 between two substrates 13 and 14. The first substrate 13 includes first transparent electrodes 17 and reflective electrodes 18. The second substrate 14 includes transparent electrodes 15 and reflective electrodes 16. During use, the light modulating device 10 is viewed from direction 7 in a closed state. In the closed state, an ambient light 21 passes through the transparent electrode 15 so as to display an image defined by drive signals on the electrodes 15 and 18. Similarly, the light modulating device 10 is viewed from direction 8 in an open state. In the open state, the ambient light 23 passes through the transparent electrode 17 so as to display an image defined by drive signals on the electrodes 16 and 17. As such, FIG. 3 and paragraphs [0024] to [0027] of Roosendaal merely describe first to fourth electrodes 15-18 that are separated, respectively, and do not describe or suggest “the first light emitting element comprises a first electroluminescent layer between a first electrode and a second electrode[,] ... the second light emitting element comprises a second electroluminescent layer between the first electrode and a third electrode[,] ...[and] the first electrode covers the first electroluminescent layer and the second electroluminescent layer,” as recited in claim 1.

For the forgoing reasons, applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1, along with its dependent claims.

Independent claim 2 recites a display device that includes, among other features, “the first light emitting element comprises a first electroluminescent layer between a first electrode and a second electrode[,]... the second light emitting element comprises a second electroluminescent layer between the first electrode and a third electrode...[and] the first electrode covers the first electroluminescent layer and the second electroluminescent layer.” As such, applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2, along with its dependent claims, for at least the reasons presented above with respect to claim 1.

#### ***New Claims***

Independent claims 19-21 each recite a display device that includes, among other

features, "the first light emitting element comprises a first electroluminescent layer between a first electrode and a second electrode[,... the second light emitting element comprises a second electroluminescent layer between the first electrode and a third electrode...[and] the first electrode covers the first electroluminescent layer and the second electroluminescent layer." As such, applicants request allowance of claims 19-21, along with their dependent claims, for at least the reasons presented above with respect to claim 1.

***Conclusion***

It is believed that all of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this reply should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this reply, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

The \$1,200 excess claim fee is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 9/14/06

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
John F. Hayden  
Reg. No. 37,640

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
1425 K Street, N.W.  
11th Floor  
Washington, DC 20005-3500  
Telephone: (202) 783-5070  
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331  
40364864.doc